

# REASONS

FOR QUITTING THE  
METHODIST SOCIETY;

BEING A  
DEFENCE  
OF  
BARCLAY'S APOLOGY.

IN ANSWER TO  
A PRINTED LETTER  
TO A  
PERSON

JOINED WITH THE  
PEOPLE called QUAKERS.

---

IN A LETTER to a FRIEND.

---

By JOHN HELTON. *K*

---

*All things: hold fast that which is good. 1 Th. v. 2.*

---

L O N D O N:

Printed by J. FRY and Co. Queen-Street, Upper-Moorfields  
And sold by T. Evans, and A. Hogg, Pater-noster-row; and  
T. Mills, in Wine-Street, Bristol.

M. DCC. LXXVIII.

REAR VIEW

FOR GIVING THE

METHODIST SOCIETY

BEING A

DEED

DECLARATION



MINISTER

PERSON

JOINED WITH THE

PEOPLE called QUAKERS

A LETTER TO A FRIEND

JOHN W. LUTON

Things: well, let that which is good: & T

LOW D O M

Printed by J. G. and Co. George Street, London: 1840.  
Printed by J. G. and Co. George Street, London: 1840.  
Printed by J. G. and Co. George Street, London: 1840.



# REASON

## FOR QUITTING

### The Methodist Society,

#### IN ANSWER TO

#### A Printed Letter, &c.

**M**Y friend's letter needs no apology. And as it is an apostolic injunction, *Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you,* I find my mind free to comply with it; and trust I shall do it, *with meekness and fear.*

1 Pet. iii.  
15.

It is asked, "What are your reasons for quitting the Methodist connection?" And "Have you read a letter to a person joined with the people called Quakers?"

To the first question, I reply, I had many reasons, which will sufficiently appear in my answer

A 2

to

\* As I have been repeatedly called upon by a number of persons in different parts of the kingdom, it seems necessary to give one general answer to these questions, which I hope may not only prove acceptable, but also beneficial to my friends.

My principal inducement therefore, in the publication of this letter, and my apology for troubling the public with it, are, that I think, I owe it as a duty to my friend, to myself, and above all, that truth requires it.

to the second query : and therefore, as I intend no reflection on a religious Society, many of whom I much esteem, I shall only observe in general on this head, that having about a year since met with Barclay's Apology, I was fully convinced, that the principles, worship, and discipline of the people called Quakers, † were more consonant to scripture, reason, and to my own feelings, than those of the Society to which I was united. Indeed, I then saw the cause of the many painful feelings, with which I had been for years exercised, as many of my sentiments coincided with theirs, though I knew it not, being carried away with the vulgar opinion of the erroneousness of their principles, &c. And as I believe, this is the state of many well-disposed minds, I wish that people of all denominations would not take things upon trust, or on the authority of any man, or men ; but simply turn their minds to the Divine Teacher in their own breast, even to the Lord Jesus, who is *the Life and Light of Men*, as well as constantly search *the Scriptures* ; for I am persuaded, that numbers so implicitly believe all they hear, that it may be said they have no creed of their own.

To the second question, I answer, I have repeatedly, and carefully perused that letter, and shall give my friend a few free remarks thereon.

But, it may be necessary to premise, that on the first superficial view, it struck me ; and I believe it has had the same effect on a certain class of readers,

† The purity and Gospel simplicity of their principles, worship, and discipline, I found my heart united to, before I was acquainted with any of that religious society ; and concluded, that if they, as a people, walked agreeably thereto, they were burning and shining lights.

readers, who either cannot, or will not look beyond the surface of things. This may account for its being deemed unanswerable. For looking into it a second and third time, it became less and less formidable: Not only so, but as I more attentively considered the objections, and discovered the fallacy of the arguments, some difficulties, which rested on my mind, were removed; as on a close inspection, it appeared, that eight out of fifteen of Barclay's propositions, were granted to be agreeable to scripture; and these eight propositions (which the objector allows do not differ from Christianity,) contain the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel: And more narrowly looking into those to which he has objected, I found reason to conclude that he now sees things more clearly, and has therefore changed his mind with regard to the seventh proposition on Justification, and the tenth on Women's preaching. My reasons for this assertion, I expect, will be sufficiently clear, when they shall be given in their proper place.

As to the fifteenth proposition, respecting *conformity to the world*, he agrees with Barclay in some things; and how he can prove that his denying flattering titles to be given to men, makes "a difference between Quakerism and Christianity," is a mystery indeed. However, this I am certain of, that if Barclay was mistaken in the several particulars objected to, his errors are harmless, being on the safe side, and such as do not hinder those who hold them, according to the objector's own words, from being "Real Christians; men who have the mind that was in Christ." I conclude

\* The objector's words are always enclosed in single inverted comma's.



I conclude therefore, that eleven out of the fifteen propositions, have nothing different from Christianity in them. Let us then calmly consider the reprobated ones, weighing the arguments which are brought to prove that they 'manifestly differ from Christianity;' and in doing this, let us follow the objector step by step, entering more minutely into the particulars we have just glanced over.

The first objection [P. 4.] is against the latter part of Barclay's second proposition, in which he treats of immediate revelation. The sentence objected to is this, "Yet these revelations are not to be subjected to the examinations of the scriptures as a touchstone."

To which the writer of that letter replies, 'Here there is a difference between Quakerism and Christianity.' 'The Scriptures are the touchstone, whereby Christians examine all [real or supposed] revelations.' 'In all cases they appeal to the law, and to the testimony, and try every Spirit thereby.'

I answer, Whatever 'manifest difference be-tween Quakerism and Christianity;' some people may see in Barclay's Apology, it is easy to see, there is a manifest injury done him, by a mutilated quotation, which quite alters the sense of that passage, and makes him speak a language, which both he and his friends disavow.

He is here represented as delivering, and consequently the people called Quakers as holding a tenet, which must fix a stigma on them, as though they slighted the Scriptures, and refused to have their doctrines and practices tried by them.

them. I will give my friend Barclay's own words, and then he may judge how fairly he has been quoted, and whether there is just ground to charge him with under-rating the scriptures. His words are, "Yet from hence it will not follow, that these revelations are to be subjected to the examination, *either of the outward testimony of the Scriptures, or of the natural reason of man, as to a more noble or certain touchstone.*"

Was it designed, or only an oversight, to leave out almost half the sentence, especially the words "*more noble or certain?*" If it was only an oversight, it is highly blameable; for the omission alters the sense of the passage. It is very obvious, Barclay's meaning is, that however excellent the scriptures are, yet they must be considered as inferior to the Holy Spirit, by which they were dictated. And he is particularly careful, while he contends for the doctrine of inspiration, to guard against the abuse of it, by saying, "These divine, inward revelations, neither do, nor ever can contradict the outward letter of scripture, or right and sound reason." And as this sentence was not only joined with, but precisely fixes the sense of that objected to, I marvel that it could be overlooked.

2. I am far from being satisfied with what is brought as a proof of Barclay's error. The objector says, 'In all cases they appeal to the law and to the testimony.'

I could not help applying to this way of proving things, what a witty author says, "Clergymen;  
"generally

- "generally set out with begging the question." This is exactly the case, in taking for granted, that the *law and the testimony* always mean the letter of scripture. No surely; for the scriptures speak of a *law written in the heart*, informing us of *its accusing, or else excusing*; they very frequently treat of the *law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, the word of God and sure testimony*, testifying of him, that he is the *inward life and light of men*. The true light to the poor Gentile world, who are not so highly favored as we are with the letter of scripture: The true light to the poor Papists, who, by designing men, are forbid the use of them: And the true light to multitudes, who through bodily infirmities, &c. are deprived of the outward testimony of scripture, Yet all these have the *Law written on their hearts*; Jesus being that glorious, universal, saving light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.
- Rom. ii. 15.  
ibid.  
Joh. i. 4.  
Joh. i. 9.

3. I think it must clearly appear, to every enlightened, unprejudiced mind, that in this article, R. Barclay is far sounder in the Christian faith, than the objector. For the latter, in affirming, 'The scriptures are the touchstone, whereby all Christian ex mine all revelations,' seems to me to renounce this glorious Gospel promise and privilege, *When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth*. That they are a touchstone, is fully subscribed to, but that they are the only touchstone, is denied, as it derogates from the office of the Holy Spirit, which is not only given to, but is to *abide* with the disciples of Christ, *to the end of the world*.
- Joh. xvi. 13.  
Matt. xxviii. 20.

4. That 'the scriptures are not the touchstone to examine all revelations,' I prove thus.
- Holy



Holy men of old, who *walked with God*, were frequently favoured with immediate revelations ; yet these men had not the letter of scripture : And ‘ if the scriptures are the touchstone to examine ‘ all (real or supposed) revelations,’ I should be glad to know, as they were destitute of this touchstone, how they distinguished the one from the other ? I take it for granted, that they had the same Holy Spirit, which Barclay pleads for as the peculiar privilege of Christians, it being promised under the Gospel dispensation, *They shall be all taught of God.* John vi. 45.

That ‘ the scriptures are the touchstone to examine all revelations,’ cannot be true, for they declare instances, wherein they could be no touchstone at all.

Philip had a revelation to join himself to the *Ethiopian, who was reading in his chariot.* Actsviii. 26.

Paul and Timothy had a revelation *not to preach the word* (at that time) *in Asia*, being *forbidden of the Holy Ghost*. They had a second revelation *not to go to Bythinia, the spirit not suffering them*, In short, (to pass by many instances of this kind) they had a third revelation to go to Macedonia. But if ‘ the scriptures are the touchstone to examine all revelations,’ what scripture could they turn to, capable of satisfying them in any of these particulars ? xvi. 6. ver. 7. ver. 10.

5. We may bring the matter nearer to ourselves. There is a variety of cases, which we may be called to act in, respecting which, although we may earnestly desire to know the will of God, the scriptures may be quite silent. Let me select a single instance, that of the Ministry.

B

Pray

Pray what Scripture can satisfy a man, "That he is inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost," \* to that important office? It will not do to say he has gifts; for I presume, that many have gifts, if by gifts we understand man's natural and acquired abilities, who are not called to that important work. And the question is not respecting qualifications, but singly this, whether any scripture can fully satisfy a man thus exercised, that what he feels in his mind, is a real, and not a supposed revelation?

There is something that looks like an objection to the third proposition, which, I confess, gives the objector the appearance of one disposed to find fault. However, he answers his own objection, when he says, 'If by these words 'be only meant, that *the spirit* is our first and 'principal leader.' 'Here is no difference between quakerism and christianity!'

I ask how is it possible to understand Barclay in any other sense? And is it not surprising that the objector should bring in an *if*, and seem at a loss for his meaning, when, in the same sentence, he quotes Barclay's words? "The spirit "is our first and principal leader." I wish therefore, that instead of playing upon words, he had given a necessary caution against a common, but dangerous error, amongst those called spiritual people, of making the scriptures supersede

\* When any person offers himself to the Bishop, to be a Minister of the Church of England, he asks him, "Do you believe that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to this office?" He answers, "I trust I am." If this was really the case with all who are called Ministers, we might reasonably expect to see a speedy and happy change take place amongst men.

superseede the necessity of the holy spirit, which our divine master promised to all his followers, when he said, *But the comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things.* And which exactly corresponds with what the beloved disciple John testifies to have been experienced by those, whom he addressed in these ever memorable words, *Ye have an unction from the holy one; and ye need not that any man teach you, but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things.* A glorious and comfortable truth! which, when experimentally known, will lead to the highest estimation of the scriptures, as they not only testify of the great love of Christ, in what he has done and suffered for sinners, but also as they give a true testimony of his redeeming power, which they have witnessed in their own hearts. And without this living knowledge of the heart, however men may idolize the scriptures, it is to them a *sealed book*, and a dead letter; which is strikingly set forth in these words, *The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.*

Jo. xiv.  
26.

1 Jo. ii.  
27.

2 Cor.  
iii. 6.

I have dwelt the longer on this subject, on account of its great importance, and because numbers of professors are not only ignorant of it as an experimental truth, but are strangers to it even in theory. And I am constrained to say, I know not any society of christians, except the people called Quakers, that bears a full testimony to the doctrine of immediate divine inspiration. It is true the established church daily prays for, and others preach, and talk much about it; but when they come to the point, some laugh at all who make pretensions of this

B 2

kind,



kind, and others charge them with manifestly differing from christianity.

The third objection is brought against the seventh proposition, which treats on justification, of which the objector says, 'Here is a wide difference between quakerism and christianity.' 'This is flat justification by works.' And adds, 'The ground of this mistake, is the not understanding the meaning of the word justification.'

To which I reply,

1. That Barclay uses the word in a sound proper sense, for, being made just, implies the remission of sins, as well as the renewal of the mind, which may properly be defined, a change of heart. And as these cannot be separated in the experience of christians, they are always connected in the scriptures. The Apostle Paul, speaking of the wonderful change wrought on some of the most abandoned characters, *1 Cor. vi. 11.* says, *And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the spirit of our God.*

And it is worthy to be remarked, that the term justification is most commonly used for being made just, as in these words, *Rom. vi. 7.* *For he that is dead, is freed [i. e. justified] from sin.* I apprehend the reason why it is so frequently used in this sense in scripture, as well as by Barclay, is because it is less liable to be abused.

2. The mistaken sense in which some understand the term justification, as implying an imputation

putation of righteousness, without the impartation thereof, arises from the absurd idea which men form of the supreme majesty; gloomy minds representing to themselves, and setting him forth to others as an implacable being, full of vindictive wrath, even against such as have not only been convinced of, but earnestly desire to forsake the evil of their ways. So that for want of just conceptions of the divine Being, and properly adverting to what the scriptures uniformly declare, *God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life*; and not clearly understanding that Christ's coming into the world was not the cause, but the effect of God's great love to all men, our gracious creator is set forth in an unamiable light, stripped of his divine perfections; and on this false foundation, a superstructure raised, which, I think, is subversive of holiness, in heart and life.

John iii.  
16.

3. But I must do justice to the objector, by saying, he has publicly confessed, that he formerly leaned too much to calvinism, with respect to the doctrine of justification, and has therefore openly asserted, 'We are every moment pleasing or displeasing to God, according to the whole of our inward tempers, and outward conduct.'

If I mistake not, this exactly coincides with Barclay, and is agreeable to *sound doctrine*, as well as to the divine testimony, which every man has in his own breast.

2 Tim.  
iv. 2.

4. As there is a common, but very unjust charge brought against the people called Quakers,

kers, by some who are ignorant of, as well as by others, who, I fear, designedly misrepresent their principles, "That they deny the fall of man, and err in the nature and cause of our justification;" this seems to be a proper place to clear up these points, which I shall attempt to do, by making an extract from Barclay's Apology, hoping it will fully satisfy every unprejudiced mind, respecting these important subjects.

Treating of justification, he says, [page 202\*.]

"First, We renounce all natural power and ability, to bring us out of our lost and fallen condition; and confess, that as of ourselves we are able to do nothing that is good; so neither can we procure remission of sins, or justification by any act of our own, so as to merit or draw it as a debt from God due to us; but we acknowledge all to be of and from his love, which is the original and fundamental cause of our acceptance."

\* I earnestly intreat, that all sensible, well-disposed persons, would carefully read over Barclay's Apology, for the people called Quakers; and I am persuaded they will not only be highly entertained, but much profited, by one of the most rational, masterly, as well as scriptural performances, of any perhaps, on such subjects, in the English language. It manifests the beautiful uniformity and true gospel simplicity of the doctrines, worship, and discipline of that people, free from all the carnal inventions of men; and also a full answer to every objection brought against them. At the same time it may be discovered, that many striking sentiments with which some late authors have enriched their works, were borrowed from the Apology.

Secondly,



" Secondly, God manifested this love towards 1 Jo. iv. 9.  
 " us in the sending of his beloved son the Lord  
 " Jesus Christ into the world, who gave himself for  
 " us an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet  
 " smelling savor; and having made peace by the Eph. v. 2.  
 " blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things  
 " unto himself; and by the eternal spirit offered him- 1 Pet. iii. 18.  
 " self without spot, unto God, and suffered the just  
 " for the unjust, that he might bring us to God."

" Thirdly, For as much as all men have sin- Rom. iii. 23.  
 " ned, therefore all have need of this Saviour,  
 " to remove the wrath of God from them, due  
 " to their offences: In this respect he is truly Isa. liii. 6.  
 " said to have borne his own body, the iniqui-  
 " ties of us all; and therefore is the one mediator  
 " between God and men; so that our former sins 1 Tim. ii. 5.  
 " stand not in our way, being, by virtue of his  
 " most satisfactory sacrifice, removed and par-  
 " doned. Neither do we think that remission  
 " of sins is to be expected, sought, or obtained  
 " any other way, or by any works or sacrifice  
 " whatsoever. So then, Christ by his death and Rom. v. 10.  
 " sufferings, when we were enemies, reconciled us  
 " to God; God is willing to forgive us our in-  
 " iquities, and to accept us; as is well expres-  
 " sed by the Apostle Paul, God was in Christ,  
 " reconciling the world unto himself, and hath com-  
 " mitted unto us the word of reconciliation. And  
 " therefore the Apostle, in the next verses adds,  
 " We pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to 2 Cor. v. 19.  
 " God; intimating, that the wrath of God be-  
 " ing removed by the obedience and death of  
 " Christ, he is willing to be reconciled to them,  
 " and to remit the sins that are past."

" We consider then, our redemption in a  
 " twofold respect, both which in their own na-  
 " ture

"ture are perfect, though in their application  
 "the one is not, nor can be, without respect  
 "to the other."

"The first is the redemption performed by  
 "Christ, in his crucified body without us: the  
 "other is the redemption wrought by Christ  
 "within us; which no less properly is account-  
 "ed redemption than the former. The first  
 "then, is that whereby a man, as he stands in  
 "the fall, is put into a capacity of salvation,  
 "and hath conveyed unto him a measure of  
 "that power, spirit, and grace, that was in  
 "Christ Jesus; which, as the free gift of God,  
 "is able to counter-balance, overcome, and  
 "root out the evil seed, wherewith we are na-  
 "turally leavened."

"The second is that, whereby we witness  
 "this pure and perfect redemption in ourselves,  
 "purifying and redeeming us from the power  
 "of corruption, and bringing us into unity,  
 "favor, and friendship with God. By the first  
 "of these two, we that were lost in Adam,  
 "plunged into the bitter and corrupt seed, unable  
 "of ourselves to do any good thing, but natu-  
 "rally united to evil, forward and propense to  
 "all iniquity, servants and slaves to the power  
 "and spirit of darkness, are, notwithstanding  
 Rom. v. "all this, so far *reconciled to God, by the death of*  
 10. "his son, that we are put into a capacity of sal-  
 "vation, having the glad tidings of the gospel  
 "of peace offered unto us in Christ Jesus."

"By the second, we witness this capacity  
 "brought into act, whereby receiving the light,  
 "spirit and grace of Christ revealed in us, we  
 "possess a real, inward redemption from the  
 "power

" power and nature of sin; and so come to be  
 " truly redeemed, justified, made righteous,  
 " and to a spiritual union with God." " Thus  
 " he gave himself for us, that he might redeem us  
 " from all iniquity. And thus we know him and  
 " the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of  
 " his sufferings, being made conformable to his  
 " death."

Tit. ii.  
14.

Phil. iii.  
10.

Hence may clearly appear what a manifest misrepresentation it is, to charge the people called Quakers, with denying the fall of man, and his recovery by Christ. And they equally injure them, who assert, that they hold ' Justification by works,' when they ascribe the whole of man's redemption to the Lord Jesus Christ.

The fourth objection to the tenth proposition, which treats of the ministry is, that in suffering women to preach, ' There is a manifest difference between Quakerism and Christianity.' And to support this charge, there are two texts of scripture produced, which are the only ones that *seem* to serve the purpose; but that they are not used in their true signification, I hope fully to demonstrate. For

1. First that the silence, which the Apostle enjoins, is, *not asking questions in the church*, is evident from a great variety of particulars, as well as from the context. Please to read the chapter, and mark the connection. The Apostle had been treating of the gift of tongues, and of persons prophesying one after another. There is reason to conclude, that in these public assemblies, there were people of different nations, as was the case on the day of Pentecost, and that one Minister had the gift of one

C

tongue,



tongue, and a second of another, in the same diversity, that they had the other miraculous gifts. For, that they all had not an universal knowledge of all languages, is clear from the <sup>1</sup> Cor. xiv. 18. Apostle Paul's words, *I speak with tongues more than you all.* How reasonable then is this conclusion, that there were a few inquisitive women in the assembly; who, not understanding what the preacher was then delivering, but prompted by curiosity, [perhaps, from a better motive] might ask questions to the interruption of the speaker and auditory? Therefore the Apostle gives this admonition, *Let your women [i. e. wives] keep silence, and if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home, for it is a shame for them to speak [that is, to ask questions] in the church.* The injunction, for <sup>1</sup> Cor. xiv. 35. *wives to ask their husbands at home*, clearly shews that the prohibition was not a general one, and that it must be confined to asking questions; for what had asking *their husbands at home* to do with their preaching? It seems a reflection on an inspired writer, to suppose he wrote so inconsistently. I think, therefore, that the exposition I have given, is easy and natural, does no violence to any part of the passage, and prevents one scripture from militating against another.

2. If this comment be rejected, how shall we reconcile the following scriptures with the common interpretation of that passage? And *it shall come to pass, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh, and your sons, and your daughters shall prophesy.* And Philip had four daughters <sup>Joel ii. 28.</sup> *who prophesied.* The Apostle Paul respectfully <sup>Acts xx. 9.</sup> mentions several women who *labored with him in*

the

the Gospel. And one he expressly styles a minister of a particular church. *I commend unto you, Phebe our sister, a servant [i. e. a minister] of the church of Cenchrea.* Nay, if he forbids women to preach, how shall we reconcile the Apostle with himself? For he gives as particular directions, respecting the manner of womens prophesying, as he does of the mens. *Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head. But every woman praying or prophesying with her head uncovered, dishonoureth her head.* I would ask, why such particular directions about the mode of womens prophesying, if it be unlawful for them to speak in the church?

Phil. iv.  
2.

Rom.  
xvi. 1.

1 Cor.  
xi. 4. 5.

3. To these striking, and, I think, unanswerable scriptures, the objector only proposes a very harmless question. 'But how do you prove, that prophesying in any of these places means preaching?'

I answer; This is an easy way of getting free from difficulties; for, if I mistake not, the proof lay at his own door; and before he drew the hasty conclusion, 'Here is a manifest difference between Quakerism and Christianity,' he should have proved, that prophesying in any of these places does not mean preaching.

4. But as the whole is rested on this single point, I shall attempt to prove, that prophesying generally means preaching, and that in those places we are more particularly concerned in, it has no other signification. And,

First. The apostle has joined praying and prophesying together; and as praying in a public

lie assembly [for of such he was treating] is universally allowed to be a part, and indeed a very principal part of the ministerial office; and women did exercise this part of the ministerial function, in being the mouth of the people to God; we have here, at least, a presumptive proof, that prophesying means preaching; and, I think, a demonstration, that the speaking in the church, which the apostle reproves in women, must be wholly confined to asking questions; otherwise it would be a prohibition against their praying, as well as preaching. For how could women pray in public, if it were a shame for them to speak in the Church, in the sense wherein it is generally understood?

Secondly, The apostle, when he uses the word, precisely fixes the meaning thereof. *He that prophesieth, speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort. He that prophesieth, edifieth the church. For ye may all prophecy, one by one, [that is, all who were qualified for, and called to the ministry] that all may learn, and all may be comforted. All may learn from those who prophesied; and women did prophesy; therefore women were teachers, by whom the church was exhorted, edified, and comforted.*

In this common acceptance we frequently find the word *prophecy* used in the Old and New Testament, *Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet; that is, shall speak unto Pharaoh, Judas and Silas, being Prophets, exhorted the brethren with many words. Anna the prophetess, coming into the temple, gave thanks unto the Lord, and spake of him [Christ] to all them who looked for redemption in Israel. Zacharias prophesied, saying, Blessed be the Lord*



*Lord God of Israel, who hath visited, and redeemed his people.* In all these places, prophesying has no other meaning than preaching; and among these preachers, we have a female. This exactly agrees with the definition the apostle Paul gives us of the word, when he defines the nature and use of it. *He that prophesieth, speaketh unto men, by doctrine and exhortation, for the edification and comfort of the church.* And that there was nothing of an extraordinary nature in the prophesying, which the apostle treats of throughout the whole chapter we have been considering, may be learned from the close of it; for the church was to judge of what was delivered. *Let the prophets speak, two or three; and let the others judge.*

Luke i.  
67.

1 Cor.  
xiv. 3.

ver. 29.

Thirdly, Should it be granted, that it does not mean preaching, it makes the case worse; for then it must have been something greater; as the apostle informs us: *He that prophesieth, is greater than he that speaketh with tongues.* And he exhorts them to *desire the best of gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy.* Hereby signifying, that prophesying was above all the spiritual and miraculous gifts, which abounded in that church. So that there is but this alternative, if they are not allowed to be ordinary, then we make them extraordinary ministers.

1 Cor.  
xiv. 5.  
ver. 1.

Some persons, when they have been closely pressed, have sought for refuge, by granting that these women, who prophesied, were called to an extraordinary work; which, I think, is giving up the whole point at once, as it grants more than is contended for. And hence we may infer, according to the well established rule, *He that*

that is called to a greater, may be called to an inferior work.

Besides, should it be granted, that prophesying means foretelling things to come, an insurmountable difficulty yet remains; for, if it was unlawful for women, who had that gift, to speak in the church, how were they to communicate what was revealed to them? If by speaking, what could this be termed, but the most excellent preaching?

Fourthly, The simple fact seems to be this, that though prophesying sometimes means predicting, or foretelling things to come, yet in the places which I have quoted, it only means preaching in the common acceptance of the word; and whenever it is used in the \* former sense, it always includes preaching, as publishing these predictions to those concerned. Hence, under the law, such persons were stiled Nebiaim, prophets, [from Ba, which signifies to come, and to go] because of their coming and going between God and the people. So under the gospel-dispensation, they are called Prophets, [from *pro*, and *phemi*, dico, I speak, or utter forth]

\* I might produce many testimonies to prove, that prophesying is used in both these senses, but shall only quote the much admired M. Henry. In his comment on prophecy, he says,

"By the Spirit they shall be enabled to foretell things to come, and to preach the Gospel, without distinction of sex, not only your sons, but your daughters; without distinction of age, both your young men, and old men; and without distinction of outward condition, even the servants and handmaids shall prophesy." Joel ii. 28, 29.

forth] because Ministers are the Lord's messengers, to publish his word of reconciliation to the people. *He hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation,* is the language of an inspired apostle: and therefore he adds, *We pray you, in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.*

2 Cor.  
v. 19.

5. I might have taken a shorter method to convince some persons, that there is nothing unlawful in women's preaching, by saying, there are several female teachers in the Methodist society; and hence I concluded, in the beginning of this Letter, that the objector has changed his sentiments in this particular. If he has not, there seems a manifest inconsistency in his suffering women to preach.

The eleventh proposition treats of religious Worship, of which Barclay says, "All true worship to God is offered in the inward and immediate moving of his own Spirit, and all worship, which man sets about in his own will, is will-worship."

1. It is well worthy my friend's particular notice, that although the writer of that letter objects to, yet he grants the whole of this proposition, when, adopting Barclay's words, he says, 'It is true indeed, "That all true worship to God is offered in the inward and immediate moving of his own Spirit," and that we cannot truly worship God, unless his Spirit move or incline our hearts.'

If so, the dispute is at an end; as all that Barclay contended for, is granted.

The



The objector's definition of inspiration is this.  
 ' God moves man, whom he has made a rea-  
 sonable creature, according to the reason he  
 has given him. He moves him by his under-  
 standing, as well as his affections, by light, as  
 well as by heat. He moves him to do this  
 or that by conviction, full as often as by de-  
 sire. And he does truly move you to preach,  
 when in his light you see light, clearly satis-  
 fying you it is his will.'

I reply, Let the Holy Spirit move the heart  
 in what manner he is pleased; for I believe,  
 that when the ' affections' are divinely moved,  
 so is the ' understanding;' and when there is  
 divine ' heat,' ' light' and ' conviction' are its  
 inseparable attendants. But this moving of the  
 Spirit on the minds of men must be considered,  
 as something which we have not at our own com-  
 mand, but is distinct from, and very superior to,  
 the mere exercise of the rational faculties.  
 This distinction, I think, the objector has not  
 sufficiently attended to, or he would not have  
 given us [what appears to me] an illustration of  
 the subject, which explains away the very nature  
 of inspiration. He says, ' You are as really  
 moved by the Spirit, when God convinces  
 you, you ought to feed him that is hungry;  
 as when he gives you ever so strong a desire,  
 impulse, or inclination.'

I answer, If this assertion is confined to the  
 action of feeding the hungry, or to any other  
 civil or relative duty, it is an undoubted truth,  
 to which every reasonable creature must sub-  
 scribe. But if it is intended to illustrate the  
 doctrine of inspiration, I object to it as very  
 foreign

foreign to that subject, as it confounds things of a very dissimilar nature. The fallacy of this way of reasoning lies in taking for granted, that they are similar cases, and consequently, that there is no more need for divine inspiration, to qualify us to worship the divine Majesty, or preach the Gospel, than to feed the hungry; the reverse of which appears to be the truth: for I know it to be my duty at all times to assist the distressed; nor need I wait to be moved by the Holy Spirit, to enable me to perform an action, which is in the power of bad as well as good men. But the case is widely different with regard to religious worship, or preaching the Gospel, which require very different qualifications. The scriptures inform us, that *we know not what to pray for as we ought, but as the Spirit helps our infirmities. And that the preparation of the heart is from the Lord.* Whereas the above illustration, as well as the practice of the objector, seem to inculcate this doctrine, That without immediate divine inspiration, we are as well qualified at any time to pray or preach, as we are capable of feeding the hungry. To this kind of inspiration, I apprehend, there is not any infidel, who can have the least objection.

But how does this agree with his assertion, 'God truly does move you to preach, when in his light you see light, clearly satisfying you it is his will?' Has Barclay said any thing stronger on the subject? The question therefore is, Do any at any time, without this *clear, satisfying light*, stand up to preach? Several persons have frankly acknowledged to me, that they have attempted to preach, when this *clear light* has been absent,—at a  
D time

time too when they have had a clear sense of being disqualified for the work; and have bewailed the necessity they were then under, of acting contrary to their own judgment. And this, I believe, [for I speak from experience] must frequently be the case with well-meaning men, who, fit or unfit, are in the practice of preaching at certain stated times. I fear there are others, who are strangers to, feel no want of, and therefore do not wait for the divine aid, to qualify them for this great work. To such persons the words of our Lord, on a similar occasion, are quite pertinent: *Your time is always ready.*

John vii.  
6.

Again: If that only is 'true worship, which  
' is offered to God, when his Spirit moves and  
' inclines our hearts,' it naturally follows, that  
' all other worship must "be false worship,"  
which is performed when the heart is not thus  
moved and inclined. It therefore is our in-  
dispensable duty to wait till his Spirit move and  
incline our hearts, without which we shall fall  
under the charge, *This people draweth nigh to  
me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their  
lips, but their heart is far from me.* Therefore it  
is, that we have so many solemn cautions against  
inconsiderately rushing into the presence of the  
Lord. *Keep thy foot,* saith Solomon, *when thou  
goest into the house of God.* That is, let thy mind  
be deeply and awfully sensible of the perfections  
of the supreme Majesty, in whose presence an-  
gels veil their faces, and in silent adoration bow  
before him. *Be not rash with thy mouth, and let  
not thine heart be hasty to utter any thing before  
God; for God is in heaven, and thou upon earth;  
therefore let thy words be few.* What a check,  
2 and

Mat. xv.  
8.

Ecclef.  
v. 1.

ver. 2.



and just reproof is this to the forwardness of the creature, who, without waiting for divine aid, which qualifies for *worshipping the Lord in the beauty of holiness*, presumes, like Nadab and Abihu, to offer strange fire before the Lord!

1 Chron.

xvi. 29.

Lev. x. 1.

Hence we see the duty and reasonableness of silent waiting on the Lord, (as the preparation of the heart is from him) without which we shall incur the censure of offering unto God the sacrifice of fools. This is strongly enforced in the following words: *We know not what to pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the heart, knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.*

Prov.

xvi. 1.

Ecclef.

v. 2.

Rom.

viii. 26,

27.

2. But of this silent waiting the writer of that letter asserts, 'In this there is a manifest difference between Quakerism and Christianity. This is will-worship, if there be any such thing under heaven. For there is neither command nor example for it in scripture.'

I answer, This is merely begging the question. For, if there is such a 'manifest difference between Quakerism and Christianity' in this particular, then some scripture condemns it, which scripture should have been produced. But should it be granted, [which I must deny] that 'there is neither command nor example for it in scripture;' yet unhappily this proof proves too much, and may be retorted with greater success, that 'there is neither command nor example, under the Gospel-dispensation,

for

for *liturgies, singing men, organs, and all those superfluous ornaments, which have been borrowed from the Church of Rome, and are diametrically opposite to the simplicity of the gospel, being the inventions of men, and introduced into the Church in the times of apostacy, to supply the want of the divine presence. We may therefore safely conclude, ' This is will-worship, if there be any such ' thing under heaven ;' for there is neither ' command nor example for it in scripture ;' nor did it take place in any Christian assembly, till the inward *glory had*, in some measure, *departed from it*.*

3. All the objections, that are brought against this silent waiting on the Lord, arise from not rightly considering the true nature of religious worship ; which may justly be defined a simple act of the mind, and all external acts are at best only so many outward expressions of it.

If this be granted, which, I think, is self-evident, it will follow, that as there may be external acts of devotion, which do not arise from the internal actings of the quickened soul, so, on the contrary, the mind may be reverently exercised in divine worship, when no verbal expressions are uttered. Thus our blessed Master defines the nature of all true worship : *God is a spirit, and they that*  
 John iv. 24. *worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth.* It therefore highly concerns all, who desire to worship the divine Being acceptably,  
 If. l. 11. to beware of *sparks of their own kindling*, and of the too common, but fatal, deception, in supposing divine worship to consist in mere outward

outward acts, while the heart remains insensible of these divine feelings, of contrition for sin, poverty of spirit, and filial gratitude to the Father of mercies. If we are destitute of these dispositions, however specious our performances may appear, and however frequent we may be in the use of them, we shall only resemble the carnal Jews, who fancied religion consisted in the splendor of their temple, and outward acts of devotion, and neglected to seek that rectitude of mind, which renders our offerings acceptable in the sight of the divine Being.

4. From what has been said, I think it is evident, that the necessity of silent waiting upon the Lord has its foundation in the nature and fitness of things. For as it is the *Holy Spirit* Rom. viii. 26. *which helps our infirmities; and we know not what to pray for as we ought, till we are thus assisted;* it follows, that 'we cannot truly worship God, unless his Spirit move and incline our hearts;' a silent waiting therefore for the moving of the Holy Spirit is not only reasonable, but our indispensable duty; and the not waiting for this divine assistance, before we begin any act of religious worship, is no less absurd, than it would have been for a diseased person, at the *pool of Bethesda*, to have stepped into the water before the *angel came down to trouble it*. So that were the scriptures perfectly silent on this head, the nature of the duty fully evinces its expediency. And I may safely add, that all those, who are unacquainted with the reverential awe, which expresses itself in the silent breathings of the soul, in humble gratitude, to the

John v.  
4.



the Author of our being ; and is what the scripture emphatically stiles, *pouring out of the soul in prayer*, are but outward-court worshippers, who have not yet entered into *the holy of holies*.

1 Kings  
i. 15.

I confess, that to natural; and I fear to some who are called spiritual men, it appears the foolishness of folly, to see a congregation waiting upon God in silence ; and therefore, they are ready to condemn, and speak evil of that which they do not understand ; so true is the declaration of an inspired writer, *The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God : for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned*. Whereas to the enlightened mind, it appears not only scriptural, but highly rational, and is at once an acknowledgment of all the divine perfections ; the omniscience, omnipresence, almighty power, and boundless goodness of our gracious Creator and Benefactor ; as well as of our intire dependance on, and expectation of receiving spiritual good, immediately from him. And why should it be thought incredible, that that glorious, infinitely exalted, and happy Spirit, *whose offspring we are ; and in whom we live, and move, and have our being*, should manifest his divine power and presence to the waiting mind, without the medium of an outward instrument ! We must assent to this, or deny the scriptures, which abundantly declare it ; the experience of Christians who bear testimony to it ; as well as derogate from the infinite perfections of the Almighty Creator. Let us not then, like the foolish Israelites, say, *Speak thou with us, and we will hear, but let not God speak to us, lest we die*. Rather, may it be the language of our hearts, *Let all creatures in heaven and earth keep*

1 Cor. ii.  
14.

Acts  
xvii. 28.

Exod.  
xxxiv. 6.

*keep silence, that that still small voice, which proclaims, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, may be heard and known, as it were, in the very center of the soul. Here is the Lord's holy mountain, where he makes unto his redeemed people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines, well refined on the lees; that is, a pure spiritual enjoyments; and where he destroys the covering and veil, that are spread over all nations.*

Exod.  
xxxiv.6.

Isa. xxv;  
67.

4. All that the objector hath urged, respecting the lawfulness of appointing times and places for public worship, falls to the ground, and only proves he mistook Barclay's meaning in these particulars; for the uniform practice of the people called Quakers from the beginning, hath fully testified, that they consider it as a duty to appoint times and places for their religious assemblies.

Many persons also greatly misapprehend Barclay, in supposing, that he pleads for entirely silent meetings, when he only pleads for a retired waiting for the divine aid, which alone qualifies to pray or preach.

5. Let us now more minutely consider preaching, as it cannot properly be stiled worship; and yet so ignorant are the bulk of mankind, that it is looked upon as almost the whole of religious worship: And at the same time so viciated is the taste of many professors, that they cannot distinguish *the chaff from the wheat*; nor can they relish any other kind of preaching, than that which has a tendency rather to amuse, than profit the minds of the hearers.

Jer.  
xxiii.28.

But

But in order to understand the true ground of the ministry, let us look back and consider, on what foundation the first ministers stood. The scriptures are abundantly clear on this head.

2 Pet. i. 21. They inform us that *holy men of God spake as they were moved by the holy Ghost. As the Spirit gave them utterance.* Of the ability which God gave, 1 Pet. iv. 11. they *prophefied one by one*, being so attentive to 1 Cor. xiv. 30. *that if any thing was revealed to another sitting by, he that was speaking held his peace, the spirit of the prophets being subject to the prophets.*

From these passages of scripture, we may infer the following particulars.

First, That their discourses were not premeditated; they delivered to the people what was immediately given them from the Lord; so that, 1 John i. 3. *in truth, they could say, Our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ:*

ver. 1. *And the things which we declare unto you, we have heard, we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the word of life, even that living word manifested in the heart, which David compares to fire; for saith he, While I mused, the fire burned, and at last I spake with my tongue.*

Pfalm xxxix. 3.

Secondly, As they prophefied *one by one*, there must have been some time of silence, to prevent two or three speaking at once.

Thirdly, The present mode of one man's preaching for an hour, without the Gospel privilege of admitting as many as are moved by the Lord to deliver his message, was not known among the first ministers.

And,



And, Lastly, The practice of the people called Quakers, in the ministration of the word, corresponds in all these particulars, with the conduct of the primitive ministers of Christ.

If it is not too absurd an idea, let my friend picture to himself, one of the Apostles writing down his sermon, or conning over some old commentator, picking out a sentence here and there, committing them to memory, and then retailing them to his auditory for the word of God. But I have done ;— as the very supposition is so absurd, that to name it, is sufficient. For these ministers were to be so led and influenced by the Holy Spirit, that they were enjoined, *Take no thought, how or what things ye shall say, for the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye shall say.* And as all true ministers stand on the same foundation, having the same commission, as well as the same gracious promise, *Lo, I am with you alway, to the end of the world ;* It follows, that they should live in a state of continual waiting and dependance on the Lord ; *speaking from the ability which God giveth, and not in the enticing words of man's wisdom.* Or, as the Apostle has it in the same chapter, *Which things we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.* Here we have a clear distinction between the true and the false minister. The former under the divine influence, publishing the counsel of God, *in the demonstration of the spirit ;* and the other amusing the people with his own inventions : of whom, Bishop Tillotson makes this pertinent remark. “ Speculative men wrought a great part of their divinity out of their own brains, as spiders do cobwebs out of their own bowels.”

Matt. x.  
19.

Matt.  
xxviii.  
20.

1 Cor. ii.  
3.

ver. 12.

E

And

And as they are distinguished in this particular, they are equally so in another; the one having *freely received*, according to his Lord's command, and the example of true ministers, freely communicates to the people. The other, whom our Lord calls an *hireling*, being influenced by lucrative motives, desires to be put into the priest's office, that he may eat a morsel of bread. They are also equally distinguished by their language. That of the true shepherd is, *I have coveted no man's silver or gold, or apparel. Yea, you yourselves know, that these hands have ministered to my necessities, and to them that were with me. Neither did we eat any man's bread for nought, but we (two Bishops, Paul and Timothy) wrought with labour and travail night and day; because we would not be chargeable unto any of you, we preached unto you the Gospel of God.*

Mat. x. 8.  
John x. 12.  
1 Sam. ii. 36.  
Acts xx. 33, 34.  
2 Theff. iii. 8.  
1 Theff. ii. 9.

How widely different is the language of an *hireling*? Like those of old, who *knew not the Lord*, they are ready to say, *Give flesh to roast for the Priest*. And should any mildly expostulate with them, that this is contrary to the injunctions of Christ to his ministers, *Freely ye have received, freely give*. They are ready to reply, *Nay, but thou shalt give it me; or if not, I will take it by force.*

1 Sam. ii. 15.  
Mat. x. 8.  
1 Sam. ii. 16.

And they are very conspicuous in a fourth particular. Our Lord having drawn a striking picture of the true and false Teacher—Of the latter he says, *They love long robes—The uppermost rooms at feasts—The chief seats in the synagogues—And to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi—That is, they*

Mat. xxiii. 6.

\* Tillotson's Works, Vol. I. Sermon. 48. page 460, 10 edit.

they sought to be distinguished by their dress, as well as by titles—Were ambitious of the chief places in church and state—To be the head of a party—Head of their brethren—*Lording it over God's heritage*—Expecting implicit faith and passive obedience from their hearers. This spirit early crept into the church, and was severely reprehended by our Lord. When there was a strife among the Disciples, who should be the greatest, he said to them, *The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and they that exercise authority upon them, are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.* And his particular charge to them was, *Be not ye called Rabbi: (Doctor) for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father. Neither be ye called Masters. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant.* Luke xxii. 25. Mat. xxiii. 8.

The twelfth proposition treats of Baptism, on which Barclay observes, "That as there is but *one Lord and one Faith*, so there is but *one Baptism.*" And that this *one Baptism* is not an outward Baptism of water, I think he very fully demonstrates. Eph. iv. 5.

To which proposition, the writer of that letter objects, 'Yea, one outward Baptism which you deny.' 'Here therefore is another difference between Quakerism and Christianity.'

I reply, That this way of proving things, by simply affirming, or denying, is very far from being satisfactory; and yet I cannot find any thing else offered as a proof here.



But this is a subject of considerable moment, and as several persons, not rightly understanding it, have run into great errors themselves, and at the same time have charged the people called Quakers with being "no Christians;" it may be necessary to examine this matter to the bottom.

1. Since *life and immortality are brought to light by the Gospel*, there is an end to all shadows, signs and figures. Thus I understand our blessed Lord, in his conversation with the woman of Samaria, *Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father. God is a spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth.* A plain intimation of the entire removal of all types and shadows, they being no longer necessary, when the substance is come.
2. It is confessed on all hands, that Water Baptism is only a sign, or figure. And the sign and thing signified by it, are two distinct things, This is granted by the objector. For I suppose, when he says, 'Yea, one outward Baptism,' he would not be understood, that this 'outward Baptism' of water, was the *one Baptism*, which the Apostle intended. And yet he must do this, or hold two Baptisms. R. Barclay makes this *one Baptism*, an inward Baptism of the Holy Ghost. The objector allows this inward one, but says, 'Yea, one outward Baptism,' in direct opposition to the Apostle's assertion, *one Baptism*.

3. That water-baptism was not instituted by Christ, as some ignorantly affirm, is very clear, when

when we consider that it was used by John, before our Lord made his public appearance. Not only so, but it is well known, by those who are acquainted with the Jewish customs, that it was one of their ceremonies; therefore calling it "an institution of Christ" tends to mislead the ignorant, and is contrary to truth.

4. Taking things for granted, without examination, is the reason that some not only say, "It is an institution of Christ," but that he commanded it, when he commissioned his disciples to *go and teach all nations, baptizing them in* (or, as some render it, *into*) *the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. This, I grant, is Christ's baptism. But look at the text, and see if water is mentioned in it. That nothing of such an outward, superficial nature could be intended by our Lord, is evident from the nature of his superior dispensation, which is all *spirit and life*. Nor is it reasonable to suppose, that our Lord should abolish some shadows and outward figures, and substitute others. I consider therefore the baptism enjoined by the founder of the Christian religion, as contra-distinguished to, and essentially different from John's. The one outward, of water; the other inward, by the Holy Ghost. Were not the *covering or veil spread over all nations*, and that the *natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God*, we should marvel that the words of Christ have been so commonly interpreted in the most gross and outward sense; especially in this instance, as John the Baptist in the clearest manner distinguishes between water-baptism, and the baptism of Christ. *I indeed,*  
says

Mat.  
xxviii.  
19.

Isa. xxv.  
7.  
1 Cor.  
ii. iv.

- Mat. iii. 11. says he, *baptize you with water ; but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.* And this exactly agrees with the prophecy of Malachi, who prophesying of the Lord Jesus, whom he styles, *The messenger of the covenant*, he adds, *For he is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap.* So his people know him, when by the brightness of his glorious, inward appearance, he consumes the man of sin ; and they feeling the painful operation, pointed out by the expressive emblem of fire, are ready to ask, in the striking language of the prophet, *Who may abide the day of his coming ! And who shall stand when he appeareth !*
- Mal. iii. 3. *When he sits as a refiner, and purifier of silver,* not to destroy, but to *purge them, as gold and silver,*
- 2 Cor. vii. 1. *from all filthiness of flesh and spirit,* for this great and gracious purpose, *that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness.* The parallel text to this, and which seems to be a beautiful illustration of it, we find in the prophecy of Ezekiel, which contains a gracious promise of that change of heart, which is productive of all holy tempers, as well as uniformity of conduct. The passage is peculiarly expressive, and may every mind not only discover its beauty, but earnestly desire to experience the full import of these words, *I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean ; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you ; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh.*
- Ezek. xxxvi. 25.

Here our Lord's words appear in their true, spiritual meaning, *Go, teach all nations.* That is, instruct them fully into the great and gra-

cious



cious designs, for which the Son of God was manifested; and baptize them into the name, that is, into the nature of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. This interpretation seems to be confirmed by the words of the apostle Peter: *And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.*

Matth.  
xxviii.  
19.

Acts xi.  
14.

If it be objected, "That to baptize in this sense of the word, is the office of the Holy Spirit," I answer it is true; but ministers may be said to baptize instrumentally; and in this sense we must understand the Apostle Paul, when he says, *I have begotten you through the Gospel.*

1 Cor.  
iv. 15.

To call any thing short of this the baptism, of Christ, must prove, and indeed, has proved a fatal mistake to many. For multitudes erred, by falsely concluding, that as they had been sprinkled with water in their infancy, or immersed when adults, they were thereby "regenerate, and grafted into Christ's church," \* though remaining intire strangers to the mind which was in Christ! To all such the Apostle Peter declares, *Not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.* This is the real inward baptism, which unites to, and makes us mystically one with Christ; of which the Apostle

Phil. ii.  
5.

Pet. iii.  
21.

\* In the office of baptism used by the established church, it is taken for granted, that all who are sprinkled with water, are thereby "regenerate and grafted in to the church of Christ." This supposition appears to me unscriptural, absurd, and highly dangerous.

- Rom. vi. 3. the Paul treats, when he says, *Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.*
- Gal. iii. 27. *By one spirit are we all baptized into one body, and have been made to drink into one spirit.*
- 1 Cor. xii. 13. The baptism here treated of, cannot possibly mean an outward one of water, for many who have been sprinkled with, or immersed in water, have not put on Christ, nor do they walk as he also walked.
- 1 Jo. ii. 6.

Again, the same Apostle, writing to Titus, says, *Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.*

Tit. iii. 5. And lest any should apprehend, this washing to be some external, he guards against so dangerous a delusion, by adding, *which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour.*

ver. 6. This is that baptism, which qualifies for the enjoyment of God here, and for his glorious kingdom hereafter. And which the lip of truth has declared, *Except a man be born again, [which is only another word for baptized] he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* For,

Mark xvi. 16. *He that believeth and is [thus] baptized shall be saved.*

That I have put no false gloss on these scriptures, is abundantly confirmed by the words of our Lord to his Disciples, after his resurrection.

Acts i. 5. *John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence; and which promise had its accomplishment, when on the day of Pentecost, the new gospel dispensation*

dispensation was opened, *and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost.* Acts ii. 4.

5. That water baptism was sometimes used in the Apostle's days, is not denied; and it is equally true, that circumcision, and the observance of the ceremonial law, was not only in use, but pleaded for by weak Christians. Shall we from hence infer the necessity of our coming under those shadows, which are termed, *weak and beggarly elements*? Which is equally the case of all figures under the gospel dispensation. But if the practice of some in the use of water-baptism, (for I think it is proved, that they had no precept for it) is obligatory, what reason can be assigned, that their practice in circumcision should not be equally binding on us? Gal. iv. 4.

Some persons ignorantly plead, "That Christ himself was baptized," and therefore enforce it as the duty of all his followers. By the same way of reasoning, we may conclude, that as Christ was circumcised, so should all Christians.

6. In the Acts of the Apostles, and in the several letters to the Churches, we are informed of the very extensive labours of the apostle Paul in planting churches. But what was the apostle's practice, with respect to these gathered churches? To be sure, if he understood his commission, *To baptize all nations*, to mean water-baptism, he would not only have been in the constant use of it, but particularly careful, not even in a single instance, to transgress his Lord's command. But he not only assures us, that he was not in the practice of it, by declaring,

F

*I only*



*I only baptized Crispus, and Gaius, and the household of Stephanas; but he also informs us, that water-baptism was no part of his commission: Christ*  
 1 Cor. i. *sent me not to baptize; [that is, with water] but to*  
 17. *preach the gospel.* Words cannot more clearly point out in what light the apostle Paul considered water-baptism.

Besides, it would puzzle the ablest disputant to prove, that the apostles themselves were baptized with water. It is very clear to me, that they were not. For who could baptize them? The scriptures assure us, that *Christ baptized not*: and if they were not baptized according to the present mode of reasoning, they were no Christians; and consequently incapable of administering, what they call "An ordinance of Christ."

The thirteenth proposition treats of the communion of the body and blood of Christ; which Barclay considers as "inward and spiritual, of which the breaking of bread by Christ with his disciples, was a figure."

It will help my friend to answer the objections brought against this proposition, by considering,

1. That as our blessed Lord was born under the law, he became subject to all its rites and ceremonies. His last act therefore, was the observance of the passover; so that this was no new institution, but as one of the Evangelists informs us, *eating the passover with his Disciples.* And which is confirmed by our Lord's words while they partook of the supper. *With desire I have*

Mark  
xiv. 14.

*have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer.* And as it was the common practice for the master of the feast, after supper to take bread and the cup, and after giving thanks to God, to distribute them among the guests, our blessed master conformed thereto, desiring them to do that act in remembrance of him. Had it been a duty to be continued amongst Christians, no doubt but our blessed Lord would have been more explicit; for, from what then passed, as recorded by the Evangelists, we can only consider the command as confined to that single action performed by the Apostles. And how can we think otherwise, when we are informed, that *Christ is the end of the law?* That is, of the shadowy dispensation. So attached indeed were some, even of those who embraced the Christian religion to these outward things, that it became necessary, sharply to reprehend them. *O foolish Galatians,* is the language of Paul to that church, *after that ye have known God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage. Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed on you labor in vain.* Not only so, but the Apostle saw it needful, to caution such superficial persons, not to condemn those who were under a superior dispensation. Writing to those who were more spiritual, he says, *Let no man judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day, or of the new-moon, or of the sabbath-days; which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ.*

Luke  
xxi. 15.

Rom. x.  
4.

Gal. iv.  
9, 10, 11.

Col. ii.  
16, 17.

That many of the Corinthians, who were carnal and walked as men, should be fond of these shadows, we need not marvel, and therefore in

1 Cor.  
iii. 3.

condescension to their weakness, and to prevent their relapsing into idolatry, they were indulged in the use of this figure. Nor was this a singular case, for in condescension to some, who were *weak Brethren*, Paul, had both  
 Acts xvi 3. Timothy and Titus, circumcised, and in several  
 Ibid. xxi instances, he himself conformed to the ceremonial law; assigning reasons for this part of his conduct, in these words: *To the weak I became as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.*  
 1 Cor. ix. 10.

2. Whether it is the duty of all Christians to be found in the practice of the supper, may be answered by asking another question.

We are informed, that our divine Master, immediately after the supper, *poured water into a basin*, and washed the Disciples feet, and then said unto them, *Ye call me Master and Lord! and ye say well, for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.* Here we have both the precept and example of our Lord, for feet-washing, in a much more explicit manner laid down, than that of the supper. Is it not then, the indispensable duty of all Christians to be found in the practice of it?

Jo. xiii. 13, 14, 15.

Those who are very much attached to outward ceremonies, answer this question, by saying, "That it was only a figure, by which our Lord designed to teach his followers the important doctrines of humility, and benevolence towards each other."

And



And is there not the same reason for concluding with R. Barclay, that "the breaking of bread by Christ with his disciples was a figure," by which he intended to instruct all his followers into the necessity of spiritually eating his flesh, and drinking his blood? As he has expressly declared, *Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.* And to guard against a gross carnal sense, which some have put on these words, our Lord added, *The flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.* And which is fully explained, when he says, *Behold, I stand at the door, and knock; if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come into him, and sup with him, and he with me.*

Jo. vi.  
53.

ver. 36.

Rev. iii.  
20.

Why our Lord's words in one place, must be understood in a figurative sense, conveying spiritual truths to the mind; and in another place, be interpreted in the most gross and outward signification, is something mysterious.

3. But it has been pleaded, that "the Apostles, who are supposed to have known the mind of their Master, were in the practice of water baptism, and the Lord's supper."

I answer, This seems to be the strongest argument, which can be urged in favor of them; but that it is not impregnable, will appear by considering the following particulars:

First, Should it be granted that the Apostles were in the use of them, it will not follow, that it becomes a duty to us; as nothing can be

can

Rom. can be a duty without a divine precept; For  
4. xv. where no law is, there is no transgression.

Secondly, The Apostle Paul's practice and declaration, *I baptized Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanas; besides, I know not whether I baptized any other. For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel,* quite overturns the argument.

Thirdly, This argument falls under its own weight, as it proves too much. For agreeably to this way of proving things, feet-washing; anointing with oil; love feasts; saluting each other with the kiss of charity; having all things in common; yea, and circumcision itself; must all be introduced into the church, as they were in use with the Apostles; which may be seen by consulting the Texts referred to in the margin.

1 Tim.  
5, 10.  
Jam. v.  
14.  
Jude 12.  
Acts xvi.  
3.

The fifteenth proposition which is objected to, as differing from Christianity, is most of all surprising, because that writer himself, as far as he went, has borne a true testimony against the evil of conformity to this world. But why it should be criminal to conform to the world in dress, and yet make 'a manifest difference between Quakerism and Christianity,' because that people testify, that the world is equally evil in its customs and language, must appear mysterious to every thinking mind; and the most favorable construction that can be put upon it, is to say, the writer's own mind has not attained to the clearness of the *perfect day*.

2. It appears to me, that he has not done Barclay justice, in fixing only upon the word,  
2 thou;

*thou*; detaching it from the connection in which it stood; and then holding it up as a scarecrow, as tho' he made the whole of the plain language to consist in using *thou* instead of *you*. Whereas it is the very smallest and lowest link in the chain. And I am fully satisfied, that had any one singled out from the objector's writings, some particular sentence, quite detached from its connection, and then ridiculed it, every candid mind would have disapproved such treatment. Let me, out of many, select a single instance, which seems full to the point. The objector has wrote against conforming to the world in dress, and pointed out the danger of an imputation in the lowest degree, saying, 'A ruffle, from one, may grow to twelve inches.' Now should any person single out this sentence, taking no notice of its connection, but in a kind of triumph, exclaim, 'Where do the scriptures forbid wearing a ruffle?' 'And the placing religion in such things as these, is such egregious trifling, as naturally tends to make religion stink in the nostrils of Infidels and Heathens.' Was any person thus to expose this well-designed caution to contempt, every fair reasoner would condemn such a procedure.

And yet this very thing the objector is guilty of. Barclay had proved to a demonstration, the apostacy of the Christian world; and, among other things, that its present language and customs, are inconsistent with the simplicity, truth, and purity of the Gospel. The dispute therefore, is not about the single pronoun *thou*, whether it is more scriptural and grammatical, to use it to a single person than *you*, for this is very obvious to all, who are not blinded by



by custom or prejudice. For after all the torturing of invention, to make *you* to a single person proper, it can never be done, as it destroys the just and necessary distinction between the second person singular and plural.

Besides, *you*, to a single person, was evil in its origin, being invented to flatter the vanity of one of the Roman Emperors, by addressing him in the plural number, as tho' he was more than mortal.

It is also evil in its nature, as it is contrary to truth to use the plural number to one person.

And, it is a departure from that scriptural language, used by God himself, and by all holy men; for a false, flattering, heathenish language, which was invented by vile sycophants, to please men of corrupt minds.

But as I hinted, altho' this is a part of the plain language, yet it stands connected with several things of greater importance. Therefore the objector should not have passed them, but ought to have proved, if it could be done, that it is quite consistent with '*speaking the truth from the heart*,' to call persons "Master and "Mistress;" and to subscribe ourselves, their "humble Servants," when no such relation subsists between us. Not only so, but that it is lawful, indiscriminately to give to poor, ignorant, sinful mortals, [and some of them the most worthless characters,] the titles which belong to the supreme Being: Such as, "reverend;" "most reverend;" "right honourable;" "worshipful;" "majesty;" "your holiness, &c." Whether

Psalms  
xv. 2.

Whether this is '*speaking the truth from the heart!* Or is it not, with a witness, giving *flattering titles to men*, of which, one, who lived under a much inferior dispensation to ours, said, *I know not to give flattering titles; in so doing my Maker would soon take me away?*

Job  
xxxii.22

3. R-Barclay therefore, concludes, "It is not lawful for Christians to give, or receive those titles, Your Majesty; Your Lordship." And the reason he affigns is, "That they alone belong to the supreme Being."

To which it is objected, 'In this there is a difference between Quakerism and Christianity.' 'St. Paul gives the title of Most Noble to the Roman Governor.'

From this objection we may learn, that it is not only lawful to give these titles to men, but also, that it is very criminal to withhold them, if it makes us differ from Christianity. This, I think, is a perfectly new discovery; and what some would term, the opposite extreme.

That Paul once gave the title of *Most Noble* to Festus, Barclay grants; but adds, "He would not have called him such, if he had not been truly noble: and indeed he was, in not giving way to the fury of the Jews against him."

To which the writer of the letter objects, 'The scripture says quite otherwise.' 'That he did give way to the fury of the Jews against him, &c.'

G

It

It seems to me, that the objector is guilty of two mistakes. First, In taking for granted, that Festus, when he asked Paul, *Wilt thou go to Jerusalem?* was in the secret of the Jews' intention to kill him; which is highly improbable, as the event fully proves. And the second error is in asserting, that the scripture says, 'That Festus did give way to the fury of the Jews against him.' I think, the scripture says the very reverse. The desire of the Jews was, that Festus would send Paul to Jerusalem. But Paul's request was to go to Rome, to be judged by Cæsar. Let the scriptures then decide, to whom Festus gave way. His words are these:

Acts xxv. 12. *Hast thou appealed unto Cæsar? Unto Cæsar thou shalt go.* We may therefore safely conclude, that Festus acted nobly by Paul, in withstanding the powerful interest of the high-priest, and the chief of the Jews, who desired favor against him, that he would send him to Jerusalem.

4. But it has been objected by others, that "the apostles themselves frequently gave the appellation of Sirs to the people. As, Sirs, ye should have hearkened to me. Sirs, be of good cheer, &c."

Acts xxvii. 21, 25.

To which I reply, that it is universally allowed, that the word *andres*, viri, rendered Sirs, has no such signification, and ought to have been translated men, as it is literally, *Men, ye should have hearkened unto me: Men, be of good cheer.* There is but one exception to this, throughout the Acts of the Apostles. There we are informed, that the awakened jailor, when in great distress of mind, addressed the apostles, saying, Sirs, (i. e. Lords) *what shall I do to be saved?*

Acts xvi. 30.



*saved?* This was his heathenish language; which he had not then parted with, but which was never used by the apostles.

And that this corrupt language, and these flattering titles, are not suitable to the simplicity and dignity of a Christian, I can prove from a comment on these words, *The elder unto the elect Lady*; which, I expect, the objector himself can have no objection to. On that scripture the author \* has this remarkable comment.

2 John  
1.

‘ Kuria (which our translators have rendered ‘ Lady) is undoubtedly a proper name both ‘ here, and in verse 5th. For it was not then ‘ usual to apply the title Lady to any but the ‘ Roman Empress; neither would such a manner of speaking have been suitable to the ‘ simplicity and dignity of an Apostle.’

Here are two things granted: first, a corruption of language; and, secondly, that this corruption of language is incompatible with the ‘ dignity and simplicity’ of the gospel-dispensation.

5. Another branch of the plain language consists in a testimony against that spirit of apostacy, in departing from the simple, scriptural language, used by God himself, and by holy men in all ages, in calling months and days by those proper names, which the Almighty gave them; and adopting in the place thereof those heathenish, idolatrous names, which were given

G 2 them

\* See Wesley's Notes on the New Testament,

them in honor of their false gods. This will clearly appear, by considering the origin of some of the months, and of all the days of the week, now commonly used; and which may be seen by consulting Chambers' and Johnson's dictionaries, from which I have mostly borrowed the following remarks, respecting the change of the names of months and days.

1. The first month was by the Romans called January, in honor of Janus, an idol with two faces, to whom the first day of this month was dedicated by the heathens, with feasting, dancings, masquerades, &c. In opposition to which, the Christians observed it as a day of fasting and humiliation.

2. The second month, according to an ancient testimony, was called February, in honor of the Prince of the infernal regions. Pliny informs us, that the first twelve days of this month were spent in offering sacrifices to the infernal powers [devils,] to render them propitious to their deceased friends: and as Pluto (the supposed prince of the infernal regions) was called Februs, in honor of him this month was called February.

3. The third month was by Romulus, one of the Roman emperors, filed March, in honor of his pretended father Mars, feigned to be the god of war; and therefore commanded that religious worship should be paid him.

4. The fourth month is supposed to have been called April, in honor of an imaginary goddess, known by the name of Venus, who was wor-  
 shipped

shipped by the Romans, and to whom the most abominable, wanton rites were paid.

5. The fifth month is thought by some to have been termed May, in honor of the senators of Rome. By others it is supposed to have been called, in honor of Maia, the mother of Mercury, one of the pretended deities, whom the idolatrous Romans worshipped.

6. The sixth month was stiled June, in honor of an heathenish goddess named Junone.

7. The seventh month has taken its name July, from Julius Cæsar, one of the Roman emperors.

8. The eighth month was called August, in honor of one of the Roman emperors, who was stiled Augustus. The title of Augustus (which signifies venerable, sacred, magnificent) was first given to Octavius, one of the emperors, as expressive of something divine and elevated in him; above the common pitch of mankind; and from that time all the Roman emperors were flattered with the title of Augustus Cæsar; that is, Sacred, Magnificent King.

9. September, October, November, and December, are the old numerical Latin names for these months, which were not changed. But it would be improper to use them now, though quite proper before the stile was altered. The Romans began their year the month called March, and therefore September was the seventh month of their year, but the ninth of ours.

And



And as the idolatrous Romans made these changes in the names of several of the months, in honor of their emperors, or false gods; so our Pagan ancestors changed the names of all the days of the week, calling them by the name of the idol, which they worshipped on that day. Hence

The first day of the week was called by our idolatrous Saxon ancestors, Sunday, (the day of the sun) because it was set apart for the worship of the sun.

The second day of the week they named Monday, (Moon's-day) as they commonly worshipped the moon on this day.

The third day of the week was termed Tuesday, in honor of an idol called Tuifco Mars, who was worshipped by that barbarous and idolatrous people on this day.

The fourth day of the week was stiled Wednesday, and dedicated to one of their idols called Wooden, whom they worshipped on this day.

The fifth day of the week they named Thursday, in honor of one of their idols called Thor, whom they worshipped on this day.

The sixth day of the week they stiled Friday; and this day was dedicated to, and called after one of their idols, named Freya.

The seventh day of the week they stiled Saturday, in honor of the planet Saturn, the supposed

posed father of the heathen gods, to whom idolatrous worship was paid on this day.

Whether it be agreeable to the purity of the Christian religion, to retain the names of these idols, and have months and days called after them, I leave my friend to judge; with reminding him, that God's people of old (when they took possession of the land of Canaan, from which the inhabitants were driven out, on account of their idolatry) were enjoined, *Make no mention of the names of other gods, neither let it be heard out of your mouth. For I will take away the names of Baalim (Heb. lords) out of his mouth. And I will cut off the names of the idols out of the land, and they shall no more be remembered. Then will I turn to the people a pure language.*

Exod.  
xxiii.  
13.  
Hosea ii.  
17.  
Zech.  
xiii. 2.  
Zeph.  
iii. 9.

6. R. Barclay says, " It is not lawful for Christians to kneel, or prostrate themselves to any man:" and the reason he assigns is, that " these are the alone outward expressions of our adoration towards God."

To which it is objected, ' If this is not lawful, then some law of God forbids it. Can you shew me that law ?'

I answer, That " these are the alone outward expressions of our adoration towards God," is a striking reason why it should not be done, if the Almighty had not expressly forbidden the *bowing down to any thing in heaven or earth*. It is also condemned by the apostle Peter, who, when Cornelius bowed down to him, said, *Stand up; I also am a man*. And the angel, before whom John fell down, said, *See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow-servant*.

Acts x.  
26.  
Rev.  
xxii. 9.

7. They

7. They nearly agree with regard to plainness of dress; but there is a reflection on the People called Quakers, as though they placed it only 'in colour and shape.'

With regard to colour, it is very obvious, that they lay no stress upon it; and as to shape, they only condemn the continually changing with every new, useless fashion, and therefore they more nearly keep to the primitive dress of their forefathers, which was not peculiar to them, but the way the nation in general dressed at that time.

With respect to the quality and price of clothes, perhaps many of them, as well as of every other religious society, have exceeded their ability. At the same time, every candid person must acknowledge, that in modesty of apparel, and freedom from superfluous ornaments, those of that society, who are consistent with their principle, are good examples to their neighbours. But is it not a contradiction in terms, for a person gravely to exhort his audience *not to be conformed to this world*, and to caution the people against superfluity of dress, when at the same time he himself is clothed from head to foot in a needless, expensive garment, which our Lord condemned in the Jewish teachers, and cautioned his disciples against an imitation of them? *Beware*, says Christ, *of the scribes, who love to go in long clothing, and to be called of men Rabbi, Rabbi.*

Rom.  
xii. 2.

Mark  
xii. 38.  
Mat.  
xxiii. 7.

8. Barclay says, "It is not lawful for Christians to swear, as our blessed Lord has commanded, *Swear not at all.*" And the apostle James says, *Above all things, my brethren, swear not.*

Ibid. v.  
34.  
James  
v. 12.

To



To which it is objected, ' Christ himself answered upon oath before a magistrate. Yea, he would not answer till he was put to his oath.'

I reply, Christ did not swear, but simply answered, *Thou hast said*. And because the high-priest adjured him by the living God, to make this an act of Christ's, and so countenance that which he absolutely forbids, is a strange mode of wresting the scriptures. What were our Lord's reasons for not answering, does not become us to say, as the scriptures are silent on this head; but to suppose, that ' he would not answer till he was put to his oath,' is indeed a most astonishing supposition! And I appeal to my friend, whether it is not more worthy of the Son of God, to suppose that he then answered, not to encourage, but to discountenance swearing. For its language seems to be, Stop, presumptuous man! No more profane the sacred name! *Thou hast said*. That is, *I am the Son of God*.

Mat.  
xxvi. 64.

Besides, oaths are not only unlawful, as the great Master has enjoined his servants, *Swear not at all*; but they are pernicious to civil society; so much false-swearing as we have in the land, having a direct tendency to harden men's hearts, and so prepare them for every act of wickedness. For it is a melancholy truth, that what on account of the strict nature of oaths, their frequent repetition, and the shameful, yea, shocking manner of administering them, (few knowing what they swear) there are hardly any offices a man can enter upon, but he has this alternative, either to be

H

perjured,

perjured, or else ruined by a faithful discharge of his office.

As for Custom-House oaths, little or no regard is paid to them, nor indeed is it hardly possible for a Master of a Ship, to invoice, or clear out his vessel without being perjured every time.

How far oaths of Allegiance to Kings are binding, the history of our own nation furnishes us with awful instances. Here we are informed of all ranks of men, now swearing Fidelity to the prince, and shortly after dethroning him. We may therefore safely conclude, *Because of swearing, the land mourneth.*

Jer.  
xxiii.10.

That swearing was looked upon by Christians as unlawful, we have several clear and undoubted testimonies handed down to us, agreeing that they considered swearing as forbidden by Christ. Therefore when an oath was tendered, the general answer was, "I cannot swear: I am a Christian."

9. R. Barclay has joined swearing and fighting together, as being both forbidden by our Lord, and therefore contrary to the Spirit of the Gospel.

The writer of that letter says, 'Whatever be- comes of the latter part of this proposition, (*fighting*) the former is no part of Christianity.'

Whether this was intended as a tacit acknowledgment that War is unlawful; or whether he was then sensible of the great impropriety, for one professing to be a minister of Christ, to countenance that murderous Spirit which is gone forth into

into all Christendom, cannot be determined.\* But as wars have many advocates, who not only speak for, but also take an active part in them, let us consider what can be said in justification of their conduct.

As the practice is not only highly irrational, but quite contrary to the peaceable and loving spirit, which the Gospel of Christ recommends, we must not expect that it gives any countenance to it; and yet the abettors of war think they can prove its lawfulness from John the Baptist's answer to the soldiers, *Do violence to no man, and be content with your wages.* And our Lord's saying to his disciples, *Let him that has no sword, sell his garment, and buy one.* Luke iii. 14. xxii. 36.

To the first of these scriptures, I answer, Let all soldiers take this advice, *Do violence to no man*, and I am bold to affirm, that there will be  
H 2 a final

\* Since the writing of that letter, he has in the strongest terms testified against war; which testimony, I wish to preserve, that it may be a standing witness, not only against war, but against those tracts which he has lately published, that countenance war.

The passage I refer to, is as follows,

' But there is a still greater and more undeniable proof, that the very foundations of all things, civil and religious, are utterly out of course, in the christian as well as the heathen world. There is a still more horrid reproach to the Christian name, yea, to the name of man, to all reason and humanity. There is war in the world! War between men! War between Christians! I mean between those that bear the name of Christ, and profess to walk as he also walked. Now who can reconcile war, I will not say to religion, but to any degree of common sense?'

Wesley on Original Sin, page 56.



a final period to wars; for maiming and shedding the blood of our fellow-mortals, and thereby sending them (perhaps unprepared) into an awful eternity, is the greatest violence we can offer them.

Should it be granted that John tolerated the use of war, (which I am far from believing) yet this is not to the point, as he was a Jew; and it was allowed that wars and swearing were lawful for them, till it was prohibited by the founder of Christianity. And as the Gospel dispensation was far more excellent than John's, therefore our Lord asserted, that though he was the greatest of all the Prophets, *yet the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.* That is, the Gospel dispensation is eminently superior to his. John was so sensible of this, that he bore this public testimony. *He must increase, but I must decrease;* which words undoubtedly referred to their different dispensations.

That divorcement, wars, and swearing, though allowed to the Jews, *because of the hardness of their hearts*, are unlawful for Christians, is evident from the following scriptures, which are full to the point, and need no comment. *It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement. But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery.* Again, *Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself. But I say unto you, Swear not at all, &c. for whatsoever is more than Yea, yea; Nay, nay; cometh of evil.* *Ye have heard that it hath been said,*  
An

*An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. But I* Exod. xxi. 24.  
*say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever* Mat. v. 38.  
*shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the*  
*other also.* And the Apostle James leads us to  
 the true source of wars, when he enquires, *From* Jam. iv. 1.  
*whence come wars and fightings? Come they not*  
*from hence, even of your lusts, which war in your*  
*members?*

The other scripture brought to prove the lawfulness of war, is our Lord's saying to his disciples, *Let him that hath no sword, sell his garment and buy one.*

To which I reply, That this scripture has its difficulty; but that our Lord never designed to countenance fighting by it, I am as fully convinced of, as that I have an existence. My reasons are these.

First, When the disciples answered, *Lord, here* Luke xxii. 38.  
*are two swords,* he replied, *It is enough.* Which answer sufficiently evinces, that this scripture must not be confined to a literal meaning. For what could two swords avail, against that armed multitude which our Lord knew was coming out against him? And the general opinion of those stiled the Fathers, was, that this scripture had a mystical signification.

Secondly, This seems to be confirmed by what passed between our Lord and Peter, who in his intemperate zeal, smote the servant of the High-priest, and cut off his ear, for which our Lord reproved him, saying, *Thinkest thou that I cannot* Mat. xxvi. 53.  
*now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me*  
*more than twelve legions of angels? Put up therefore*  
*thy*

*thy sword into its place.* As though he had said, Peter, thou hast mistaken me. I do not need these carnal weapons. No: I utterly prohibit the use of them; *For all they that take the sword,*  
 Mat. xxvi. 52. *shall perish by the sword.*

Thirdly, Wars are not only forbidden by, but are directly opposed to the spirit of the Gospel. Here we are enjoined, *Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use and persecute you. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good. That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven, for he maketh his sun to arise on the evil, and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.* When Isaiah in vision saw this glorious Gospel-day, he sang,  
 Mat. v. 44.  
 Rom. xii. 30.  
 Mat. v. 45.  
 Isa. ii. 4.  
*They shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.* I believe that this prophecy is fulfilled in every heart, where the Prince of Peace reigns.

I sincerely wish therefore, that well-disposed persons, who have been blinded by custom, and carried away with the current of evil example, would seriously consider this subject, and I am satisfied, they will see the great impropriety of setting apart times of prayer, for imploring the God of love to give success to destructive weapons. And I am persuaded, that with great truth, it may be said to many, *Ye know not what ye ask.* Or, as our Lord said to his disciples on a similar occasion, *Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.* For if these prayers have any meaning,



ing, it is, that every bullet may do execution, and every sword may be bathed in blood. And to return thanks to the divine Majesty for success of this kind, argues a mind ignorant of the divine perfections, to whom such prayers and thanksgivings are as acceptable, as the *cutting off a dog's neck, or the offering swine's blood.*

Isa. lxvi.

33.

That frantic mirth also, which discovers itself in public rejoicings on these occasions, is a disgrace not only to the Christian name, but to humanity itself. The pure principle therefore, leads to an uniform testimony against such ungodly customs. And happy are they who are faithful to it, though they are the derision of a thoughtless giddy multitude, and even on account of their truly Christian testimony, suffer the *spoiling of their goods.*

Heb. x.

34.

And all those who take an active part in wars, are highly concerned to enquire, what is their principle of action. And whether a dispute between Princes, will justify them in the sight of God, for seizing on the property and destroying the lives of their fellow-creatures, even though they have the sanction of human laws.

I know that the common objection is, "If these pacific principles prevail, our property will become a prey to every invader." Yes. *If the Lord has forsaken the earth: But if the Lord reigneth, and we fear his name, he will be a wall of fire round about us.* A remarkable instance of which, we have in the case of the Jews, who being enjoined by God, *Thrice in the year shall all your males appear (at Jerusalem) before the Lord;* the promise of God to them was, *Neither shall any*

Ezek. ix.

9.

Ps. xciii.

1.

Zech. ii.

5.

Exod. *any man desire your land, when you shall go up to ap-*  
xxxiv. *pear before the Lord your God thrice in the year.*

23.

Gen. *Which promise, Josephus, the Jewish historian,*  
xxxv. 5. *informs us, was so punctually fulfilled, that though*  
*their enemies knew these stated seasons, and that*  
*their cities and towns were then defenceless, yet*  
*at these times they were never invaded, the ter-*  
*ror of the Lord being upon their enemies that were*  
*round about them.*

Nor need we look so far back, as the settle-  
ment of the people called Quakers in the Pro-  
vince of Pennsylvania furnishes us with a recent  
proof of what I have advanced, and which has  
been so remarkable, as to engage the attention,  
even of infidels. The fact is this. That province,  
surrounded by savage nations, and destitute of  
warlike instruments, either offensive or defensive,  
yet for almost a century, enjoyed uninterrupted  
tranquility, while the other Provinces have been  
repeatedly attacked by their savage neighbours.

Not only so, but the pacific principles of that  
people, and their upright conduct towards the  
natives, in purchasing the land from them, (though  
it was granted by the crown) have made such an  
impression on the minds of this savage people,  
that to this day they have lived in perfect harmo-  
ny with them, and speak of W. Penn, the first  
Proprietor of that Province, with the greatest  
respect.

I have now freely delivered my sentiments. I  
hope it has been done in a proper temper. For  
although truth leads to the greatest plainness, yet it  
dictates no improper reflection, much less abusive  
language, which are too common in some of the  
most

admired controversial writings. I intended to close the whole, with a few remarks on the conclusion of that letter; but on a review, finding it made up of a number of mere declamatory assertions, calculated to misrepresent and fix a stigma on a religious society of people, and totally destitute of argument, I pass it over, as a proper answer would lead to some degree of severity, which has been my study to avoid.

However, I must say, that I fear more pains are taken, by persons of all denominations, to profelyte to a name, than to something more substantial. When alas! What do names signify, if we are strangers to the love of God, and the love of our neighbour? And what will it avail us, that we are orthodox in our principles, while our hearts are heterodox? We may boast of our well-composed forms of prayer, or pique ourselves that we have laid aside these inventions of men, silently to wait on the Lord; yet if our own hearts are not divinely changed from the love and spirit of the world, into the love and image of God, though we differ in name and sentiment, we all belong to one family, and are out of the true church; having only a name to live, while we are in reality, *without God in the world*: Eph. ii, 12. And should death cut the slender thread of life, the immortal spirit, which is disunited from God, and in a state of impurity, would be incapacitated for inhabiting his glorious kingdom; and therefore must be excluded *from his presence*. 2 Thess. i. 9.

I therefore earnestly wish, that all blind party zeal may come to an end; that instead of labouring to fix a stigma on those, who see it their duty to dissent from us, our great concern may be, to guard against a narrow, unchristian spirit;



rit: And may the uniform language of our  
 2 Cor. hearts and lives be, *Henceforth know we no man*  
 v. 16. *after the flesh. But whosoever shall do the will of*  
 Mat. xiii. *my Father who is in heaven, the same is my Brother,*  
 50. *and Sister and Mother.*

This is the ardent Desire of

Thy affectionate Friend,

Melksham, 3d Mo. 28,  
 1778.

J. HELTON.

20 AP 57

F I N I S.

our  
can  
of  
et.

no  
unt  
and  
dw

ric  
ric  
ind  
ll

lov  
an  
tio  
w

the  
the  
he  
and

im  
im  
of  
w

An  
the  
and

for  
for  
8

gar  
lab  
dun  
be